

Solid Waste Alternatives Program Advisory Council
State Capitol Building Room 305
October 28, 2008
9:00 a.m.

Minutes

9:00 a.m. Meeting Begins

9:15 a.m. Public Participation Period (3 Minutes Per Person)

Approval of Agenda

DECISION ITEM

No discussion

Motion and 2nd to approve Unanimous approval

Approval of Minutes

DECISION ITEM

No discussion

Motion and 2nd to approve Unanimous approval

Introduction of 9th Council Member

INFORMATION

Scott Smith has been appointed by the director.

He has some early dealings with the development of the legislation.

Welcome Scott

Fee Structure/Flexibility

INFORMATION

Discussion of if a portion of the planning are wanted to participate. Can we split the fee? HF 2570 says "Planning Areas". Fees are by "Planning Area". Brian still wants to invest further, as this would be difficult to manage. So this needs further investigation.

Could staff develop options on how to address these scenarios?

Planning areas were formed under the comprehensive planning scheme in the late 1980's. Does this still make sense to have these boundaries for the purpose of EMS.

This is not for the council to decide. The DNR should make that determination.

DNR will come up with some scenarios and discuss it further at the **next meeting**.

Defining Conflicts of Interest (Mary and Shelly)

DECISION ITEM

Shelly and Mary looked at several different conflict of interest statements.

This one was one from the Iowa Power Fund Board. We are a government

created agency. We feel we are similar to the Iowa Power Fund Board, we are reviewing applications and are created by legislation.

Full Disclosure – abstain from discussion and voting.

Strike wording “or stockholder of a corporate applicant”

If participants in the program/award of funding to an agency, then they have a conflict of interest.

Motion and 2nd to approve as amended. (Strike wording “or stockholder of a corporate applicant”)

Unanimous Approval

No need for council members to sign off on this. **We will add it to the procedural guidelines.**

Discussion on what is an EMS (see Handout)
and how does the EMS in HF2570 differ

INFORMATION

We need to make clear what it is we’re talking about.

Some of the objectives, targets, environmental impacts should probably be in there, but some of the record keeping, responsibility type of things are not as applicable.

The focus of the legislation was to provide a flexible system to increase innovation. We need to focus on the intent, and not trying to make the title fit into what other organizations have done.

An EMS gets folks involved from the operations level. You can pick a component and then go after it. It must be measurable.

We need to remember that their baseline will be different from everyone else.

What we’re looking for is a cross between the 10 items in the Missouri document, and the things on the EMS handout from Brian, as well as the 6 planning components in the legislation.

We need to have the measuring aspect.

Goals must be measurable and attainable. (And sustainable)

We need to remember the hierarchy. Some things like banning burning may actually increase the amount going to the landfill, but the greater good is reducing dioxins in the environment.

We have areas that are following the hierarchy, but still can’t meet the goal.

An EMS will more accurately show how well you are meeting your goals.

We can use the 10 items in the list for targeted projects. Put the responsibility on the applicant.

We need to make it meaningful.

The SWAP application says: obtain, measure, sustain, justify. This is a good model.

We want to follow the plan, do, check, act, (EMS) model and use some of the elements.

Some of the items are overarching, the objectives and targets is where you get more specific to the 6 planning components. Then you will have to do some of the items for each specific component.

We need to look at the 2 handouts and lay out what makes sense. What are the overarching elements, and what are the programmatic components?

The SWAP application can be a starting model.

It is important now for us to all agree what an EMS is. Plan, Do, Check, Act, and must include these elements...Brian, Scott, Mary and Tony will work together on this. *The council ended up working on this later on in this same day.

Continuous Improvement (Sara and Jen)

DECISION ITEM

This is guidance so we agree what continuous improvement means. This is meant to be a policy for our benefit.

When we send out the letter we need a definition of what continuous improvement is.

Do we need to address the 6 components? There may be other components.

Motion and 2 nd to Approve Unanimous approval

We will add this to the procedural guidelines.

Small Group Inventory of Eligible Activities under each of the 6 Planning Components

- Yard Waste Management

DECISION ITEM

We will divide into groups to discuss what activities/programs would we consider being under this topic?

We would like to have a menu of possible items, but not limited to these.

First we want the list of activities. Then we get into what's the eligibility.

How wide spread does it have to be, etc. (one city of all planning area?)

This is to be discussed at the second application portion.

This is just a list of possible items; they are not limited to this.

- Burn ban/incentives not to burn
- Backyard composting
- Compost facility
- Curbside yard waste collection
- Mulching/leave it lay
- Make compost bags available
- Vermicomposting
- Yard Waste drop-off collection sites(roll-offs)

It was decided that this is not the direction that the council wants to go.
(See EMS Elements)

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| • Hazardous Household Waste Collection | DECISION ITEM |
| • Water Quality Improvement | DECISION ITEM |
| • Greenhouse Gas Reduction | DECISION ITEM |
| • Recycling Services | DECISION ITEM |
| • Environmental Education | DECISION ITEM |

The legislation already lists some items that would fall under each component. Is this good enough? By providing a list we may be limiting the ideas of the people applying.

The EMS gets to the details of what the program consists of. The people applying will come forward with the ideas.

Should we come up with metrics?

Should we let them come up with the ideas and the metrics?

We need some sort of measurement. Diversion/Impact verses tonnages, how do you pick one over the other?

We could discuss the EMS elements and then move into the application.

EMS ELEMENTS (added Agenda Item)

We have 3 main overarching elements, and then decide action steps for each component.

1. Environmental Policy Statement
2. Environmental Impacts
3. Legal and other requirements

Component Specific:

4. Objectives and Targets
5. Action Plan (include review and updates of objectives and targets, roles and responsibilities and timelines)
6. Identify key resources and additional needs
7. Communication/Training/Awareness
8. Monitoring and Measurement
9. Assessment
10. Reevaluation and modification

Later on we'll have to consider the audit portion.

Motion and 2nd to approve these 10 items as the framework Unanimous approval

Scott, Tony, Brian, and Mary can work on the explanations of each.

Brian provided handouts, FYI:

- Current LMOP Landfill and LFG Energy Project Database Candidate landfills
- WARM - Waste Reduction Model
- Calculating the Cooling Effects of Waste Reduction
- Waste Management and Energy Savings: Benefits by the Numbers

Pilot Project

We want to get an initial idea of who is interested. And then after the initial cut we get more into the EMS Elements.

- Initial Application DECISION ITEM
 - Format

We want them to show their interest in participating in the program.

We are not talking about money right here. We need to be sure people know this is not just another funding opportunity. It's more than that.

We need to show the incentive to participate though.

The tonnage fee benefit would also be enough "funding" to make this worthwhile to an area in some cases.

Look at the checklist sent out at our first meeting?

Send a letter from the council to gauge interest? Details include it's a pilot program, voluntary program, they'd be assisting the council with the bigger picture, explain funding opportunities, continuous improvement definitions, long term goals for the agency.

How do we determine who should go to the next level?

Is the first step just a letter to gauge interest? Leave the checklist out of it for now.

We may need to change our public participation rules to allow them to jump in and discuss openly with us. They can come into our meetings and participate in the meetings.

Initial letter can contain the EMS Elements as framework.

Homework – develop initial letter while the elements definitions are being developed. Tom Hadden will put something together for discussion at the next meeting.
 - What must be provided
 - Letter
- Submittal DECISION ITEM
- Evaluation to get to the next submittal level DECISION ITEM

Scheduling Future Meetings

- November 13, 12:00 – 4:30
- December 15, 9 a.m. (12th has been cancelled)

Adjourn

Motion and 2nd to adjourn Approved unanimously

Homework/Parking Lot:

- Everyone think of application ideas (look at SWAP application)
- Get scoring sheet from Jim Bodensteiner
- Scott, Tony, Brian, and Mary will work on the explanations on each of the EMS Elements.
- Tom Hadden will work on developing the initial letter while the elements definitions are being developed.
- Fee Structure/Flexibility -DNR staff will look at options on how to address these scenarios. DNR will come up with some scenarios and discuss it further at the next meeting.

Next meeting:

- Discuss/Approve the letter developed by Tom
- Discuss/Approve the definitions to the elements developed by Mary, Scott, Tony, and Brian
- Draft of application form (for the 2nd cut)
- Criteria for approval (informational needs)
- Planning area whole vs. broken out/Fee Structure/Flexibility – any new information?

Sign In

Solid Waste Alternatives Program Advisory Council

State Capitol Building

October 28, 2008 9a.m.

Name	Representing/Organization
Brian Toimuy	DNR
Becky Solby	DNR
Alex Moon	DNR
Sara Bixby	SCISWA
Ben Jordan	Iowa Recycling Association
Donovan Olson	HD 48
Tom Hadden	Metro Waste Authority
Mary Wittry	ISUSWO
Scott Smith	Central IA Waste Management Assoc.
Tony Colosimo	NSWMA
Mary Jensen	IWEI
Matt Eide	Artistic Waste
Zeb Fuchez	Human Democratic Staff
Jennifer Ryan	ECICOG
Darrin Gage	CRLC Solid Waste Agency
Reo Menning	Metro Waste Authority
Paula Feltner	waste Management
Mike Heller	WM
Shelly Gdner	IWE